REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27 stand rejected.

Applicants thank the examiner for the telephonic interview of March 13. Applicants have taken the examiner's comments into consideration in composing the present communication.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

The examiner rejected "associating" as it is used in the claims. Applicants have amended the claim language to clarify the technique used: "assigning said target type to said undefined operator." Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended overcome the examiner's rejection.

The examiner rejected "calculating … set" as it is used in the claims. Applicants have amended the claim language to clarify the technique used: "Wherein said first set of types comprises types resulting from performing said operation of said operator on any possible set of hypothetical operands HO_1 through HO_n, where each hypothetical operand HO_m is of a type to which there is a widening conversion from type T_m." Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended overcome the examiner's rejection.

The examiner rejected "computing … operation" as it is used in the claims. Applicants have amended the claim language to clarify the technique used: "performing said operation of said operator on said converted operands O_1 through O_n." Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended overcome the examiner's rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)

The examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by "C#

Language Specification", Version .28, May 2001 (hereinafter; C# Language Specification).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 19 to disclose that "at least one operand is of

an undefined type. This is supported in the specification in at least paragraphs 1, 26, 38, 52, 53,

and 63. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of the reference does not teach the

claims as amended. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for

allowance.

Claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 11-16 depend from independent

claim 10. Claims 20-25 depend from independent claim 19. Applicants respectfully submit that

claims 2-7, 11-16, and 20-25 are in condition for allowance because they depend from claims

that are in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended claims 8 and 17 to include the step, "parsing the expression to

determine the operator, the first operand and the second operand, wherein at least one of the set

comprising the first operand and the second operand is of an undefined type." This is supported

in the specification in at least paragraphs 1, 26, 38, 52, 53, and 63. Applicants respectfully

submit that the cited portion of the reference does not teach the claims as amended. As such,

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8. Claim 18 depends from claim 17. Applicants

respectfully submit that claims 9 and 18 are in condition for allowance because they depend from

claims that are in condition for allowance.

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected by the examiner under 35 USC § 102(b) for "merely manipulating a mathematic algorithm." Applicants respectfully submit that, if the examiner intended this rationale, then the examiner intended to reject the claims under 35 USC § 101 and will proceed as such. If applicants are wrong on this point, applicants respectfully request that the present office action be amended and re-issued.

As discussed prior with regards to the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, rejection, Claim 26 has been amended to clarify the technique used: "assigning said target type to said undefined operator." Applicants respectfully submit that this technique as amended produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result," and is therefore patentable subject matter. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175 (1981). As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 27 depends from independent claim 26. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is in condition for allowance because it depends from a claim which is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 31, 2008

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer
Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439